

Members of the Judiciary Committee,

I am writing this testimony in **opposition** to **H.B. 6667** AN ACT CONCERNING GUN VIOLENCE and **H.B. 6816** AN ACT CONCERNING MICROSTAMPING-ENABLED PISTOLS, RAISING THE AGE TO PURCHASE AMMUNITION AND RESTRICTING THE SALE AND POSSESSION OF BODY ARMOR.

I am also writing in **support** of **H.B. 6817** - AN ACT CONCERNING AN INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO OWN, POSSESS OR CARRY A FIREARM.

I oppose bills H.B. 6667 & H.B. 6816 on all fronts. I find them to be overly complex and severe. They restrict gun rights in complex and convoluted ways. I believe the rules and regulations they contain would be hard for an average citizen to understand and make those, who have previously been following the law, in violation perhaps without realizing it. Rather than grandfathering old standards and common practices, these bills make those who were compliant over the last 5 decades guilty of felonies. Many of them probably don't keep up with the complex restrictions and updates to these laws.

The vast amount of new restrictions and regulations would again make it harder for manufacturers to sell guns in CT. Such as microstamping. As most manufacturers are unwilling to do that for CT's small population. For example, I wanted to purchase a Sig P322 pistol a few weekends ago. A target-style .22 pistol to train with. I was surprised to find out that it isn't sold in CT because it has a threaded barrel, which is prohibited, and Sig seems to be unwilling to make a skew without a threaded barrel just for CT. A change that would be considered relatively minor. Having to change the manufacturing process for microstamping many parts of a handgun just for 1 state is unfathomable and I can imagine almost no manufacturers doing this. It would prop up a niche market specifically for CT which would increase already higher prices and decrease the quality and depth of products available.

These bills are designed to limit the ability to protect and defend yourself to those with money and/or authority(see the numerous exemptions for Law Enforcement and Public Servants scattered throughout the bill).

I support H.B. 6817 because it provides some long-needed clarity and regulation to the permitting process. For years the ability for a CT resident to get a Pistol Permit to purchase and own a firearm has largely depended on the municipality in which they reside. Any town wanting to bar the process or without the resources to handle it can effectively prolong the process indefinitely preventing the issuing of said permit. To me, this is unacceptable for a right guaranteed by the state and federal constitutions.

This bill would also allow the carrying of a firearm in state parks. A restriction I have long wanted to be lifted. This has always been troubling to me. State parks are some of the areas I want to carry my firearms the most as protection from wildlife in an emergency. They are often remote and far from emergency services.

Thank you,
Benjamin Palizza
Vernon Resident